

ON HIDDEN EXTENDERS

Moti Gitik

School of Mathematics
Raymond and Beverly Sackler
Faculty of Exact Sciences
Tel Aviv University
Tel Aviv 69978 Israel

1. Introduction

Let κ be a singular cardinal violating GCH or a measurable with $2^\kappa > \kappa^+$. The strength of this hypotheses was studied in [Git1,2] and [Git-Mit] combining Shelah's *pcf* theory with Mitchell's covering lemma. The basic approach was to use the covering lemma in order to change sequences witnessing *pcf* to better and better one.

A principal point there was to reconstruct extenders as in [Git-] or to show that extenders of an indiscernible sequence do not depend on a particular precovering set as in [Git-Mit]. This was shown to be true for $\text{cof}\kappa > \omega$ or under the assumption that for some $n < \omega$ $\{\alpha < \kappa \mid \mathcal{K} \models o(\alpha) \geq \alpha^{+n}\}$ is bounded in κ .

The purpose of this paper will be to show the above breaks down if for every $n < \omega$ $\{\alpha < \kappa \mid \mathcal{K} \models o(\alpha) \geq \alpha^{+n}\}$ is cofinal in κ .

2. Types of Ordinals

Fix $n < \omega$. For $k \leq n$ let us consider a language $\mathcal{L}_{n,k}$ containing a constant c_α for every $\alpha < \kappa_n^{+k}$ and a structure $\mathbf{a}_{n,k} = \langle H(\lambda^{+k}), \in, \lambda, \leq, 0, 1, \dots, \alpha, \dots \mid \alpha < \kappa_n^{+k} \rangle$ in this language, where λ is a regular cardinal big enough. For an ordinal $\xi < \lambda$ (usually $\xi < \kappa_n^{+n+2}$) denote by $tp_{n,k}(\xi)$ the $\mathcal{L}_k$ -type realized by ξ in $\mathbf{a}_{n,k}$. Further we shall drop n whenever it will not lead to confusion. If δ is an ordinal below λ then we shall consider a language $\mathcal{L}_{k,\delta}$ obtained from $\mathcal{L}_k$ by adding a new constant c and a structure $\mathbf{a}_{k,\delta}$ as above with c interpreted as δ . $tp_{k,\delta}(\xi)$ is defined in the obvious fashion.

Lemma 2.1. *Suppose $2 < k \leq n$ and $tp_k(\gamma) = tp_k(\delta)$. Then for every $\xi < \lambda$ there is $\rho < \lambda$ such that $tp_{k-1,\gamma}(\xi) = tp_{k-1,\delta}(\rho)$.*

Proof: $tp_{k-1,\gamma}(\xi)$ can be viewed as a subset of κ_n^{+k} and by GCH as an ordinal less than κ_n^{+k} . Since $H(\lambda^{+(k-1)}) \in H(\lambda^{+k})$, the existence of ξ having $tp_{k-1,\gamma}(\xi)$ can be expressed by single true in $\mathbf{a}_k$ formula of $\mathcal{L}_k$. Hence δ satisfies this formula as well. So there is $\rho < \lambda$ with $tp_{k-1,\delta}(\rho) = tp_{k-1,\gamma}(\xi)$. $\square$

The restriction $k > 2$ is not essential for the proof but further this will be the only interesting case. Since we are going to deal with measures over κ_n 's, the total number of them is κ_n^{+2} . So $k > 2$ will be responsible for not dropping to isolated types.

It is possible to consider instead of single δ and $tp_{k,\delta}$ finite sequences of ordinals $\delta_1, \dots, \delta_j$. The corresponding definitions of $\mathcal{L}_{k,\delta_1,\dots,\delta_j}$, $\mathbf{a}_{k,\delta_1,\dots,\delta_j}$ and $tp_{k,\delta_1,\dots,\delta_j}(\xi)$ are obvious. The next lemma is similar to Lemma 2.1.

Lemma 2.2. *Suppose that $j, k \leq n$ and $k - j > 2$. Let $\langle \delta_1, \dots, \delta_j \rangle, \langle \gamma_1, \dots, \gamma_j \rangle$ be so that*

$$(a) \quad tp_k(\gamma_1) = tp_k(\delta_1)$$

$$(b) \quad \text{for every } i < j$$

$$tp_{k-i, \langle \gamma_1, \dots, \gamma_i \rangle}(\gamma_{i+1}) = tp_{k-i, \langle \delta_1, \dots, \delta_i \rangle}(\delta_{i+1}) .$$

Then for every $\xi < \lambda$ there is $\rho < \lambda$ such that

$$tp_{k-j, \langle \gamma_1, \dots, \gamma_j \rangle}(\rho) = tp_{k-j, \langle \delta_1, \dots, \delta_j \rangle}(\xi) .$$

Lemma 2.3. *There are $\xi, \rho \in (\kappa_n^{+n+1}, \kappa_n^{n+2})$ such that $tp_n(\xi) = tp_n(\rho)$.*

Proof: Easy, since $2^{\kappa_n} = \kappa_{n+1}$ and each type can be viewed as a subset of κ_n . □

Now let us deal with all n 's simultaneously.

Definition 2.4. Let $\bar{\xi} = \langle \xi_n \mid n < \omega \rangle$. $\bar{\rho} = \langle \rho_n \mid n < \omega \rangle$ be two sequences in $\prod_{n < \omega} \kappa_n^{n+2}$ and $n^* < \omega$. We say that $\bar{\xi}$ and $\bar{\rho}$ are equivalent starting with n^* iff for every $i < \omega$ $tp_{3+i}(\xi_{n^*+i}) = tp_{3+i}(\rho_{n^*+i})$. $\bar{\xi}$ and $\bar{\rho}$ are called equivalent if there is $n^* < \omega$ such that $\bar{\xi}$ and $\bar{\rho}$ are equivalent starting with n^* .

Definition 2.5. Suppose that $\bar{\xi}, \bar{\rho}$ are equivalent sequences and $\bar{\gamma}, \bar{\delta} \in \prod_{n < \omega} \kappa_n^{n+2}$. Then $\bar{\gamma}, \bar{\delta}$ are called equivalent over $\bar{\xi}, \bar{\rho}$ starting with $n^* < \omega$ iff for every $i < \omega$

$$tp_{3+i, \xi_{n^*+i}}(\gamma_{n^*+i}) = tp_{3+i, \rho_{n^*+i}}(\delta_{n^*+i}) .$$

Lemma 2.6. *Suppose that $\bar{\xi}, \bar{\rho}, \bar{\gamma} \in \prod_{n < \omega} \kappa_n^{n+2}$ and $\bar{\xi}, \bar{\rho}$ are equivalent. Then there is $\bar{\delta} \in \prod_{n < \omega} \kappa_n^{n+2}$ such that $\bar{\gamma}, \bar{\delta}$ are equivalent over $\bar{\xi}, \bar{\rho}$.*

Proof: Follows from Lemma 2.1. □

3. The preparation forcing

Suppose $\kappa_0 < \kappa_1 < \dots < \kappa_n < \dots$, $\kappa_\omega = \bigcup_{n < \omega} \kappa_n$, $o(\kappa_n) = \kappa_n^{+n+3}$. We define a forcing of the type used in [Git-Mag1], [Git-Mag2]. This remains especially those of [Git-Mag2], section 3, but it will be different in a few important points which will be used in further construction.

For every $n < \omega$, let us fix a nice system $\mathbb{U}_n = \langle \mathcal{U}_{n,\alpha} \mid \alpha < \kappa_n^{+n+2} \rangle, < \pi_{n,\alpha,\beta} \mid \alpha, \beta < \kappa_n^{+n+2}, \mathcal{U}_{n,\alpha} \triangleleft \mathcal{U}_{n,\beta} \rangle$. We refer to [Git-Mag1] for the definitions.

Let $n < \omega$ be fixed. We define first a forcing Q_n for adding one element Prikry sequences for $\mathcal{U}_{n,\alpha}$'s ($\alpha < \kappa_n^{+n+2}$).

Definition 3.1. A set of forcing conditions Q_n consists of all elements p of the form

$$\langle \{ \langle \gamma, p^\gamma \rangle \mid \gamma < \delta \}, g, T \rangle$$

where

- (1) $g \subseteq \kappa_n^{+n+2}$ of cardinality $< \kappa_n$
- (2) $\delta < \kappa_n^{+n+2}$
- (3) if $g \neq \emptyset$, then g has a $\leq_n$ -maximal element and $0 \in g$. Further we shall denote g by $\text{supp}(p)$, the maximal element of g by $mc(p)$ and δ by $\delta(p)$.
- (4) $\delta \geq \cup g$
- (5) for every $\gamma \in g$ $p^\gamma = \emptyset$
- (6) for every $\gamma \in \delta \setminus g$ p^γ is an ordinal less than κ_n^{+n+2}
- (7) $T \in \mathcal{U}_{n,mc(p)}$

Denote T by $T(p)$.

Definition 3.2. Let $p, q \in Q_n$. We say that p extends q ($p \geq q$) if

- (1) $\delta(p) \geq \delta(q)$
- (2) for every $\gamma \in \delta(q) \setminus \text{supp}(q)$ $p^\gamma = q^\gamma$
- (3) if $\text{supp}(p) \neq \emptyset$ then $\text{supp}(p) \supseteq \text{supp}(q)$ and $\pi_{n,mc(p),mc(q)}'' T(p) \subseteq T(q)$.
- (4) if $\text{supp}(p) = \emptyset$ then $p^{mc(q)} \in T(q)$ and for every $\nu \in \text{supp}(q)$ $p^\nu = \pi_{n,mc(q),\nu}(p^{mc(q)})$.

Definition 3.3. Let $p, q \in Q_n$. We say that p is a direct extension of q ($p \geq^* q$) iff

- (1) $p \geq q$
- (2) $\text{supp}(q) \neq \emptyset$ implies $\text{supp}(p) \neq \emptyset$.

Intuitively, we are going to add a one element Prikry sequence for every $\nu \in \text{supp}(p)$. But there will be κ_n^{+n+2} coordinates where nothing happens. Namely we are allowing p^γ 's to be ordinals even above κ_n and this intended to prevent putting Prikry sequence over γ .

The proofs of [Git-Mag1] generalize directly to the present situation. Notice that in the argument with elementary submodel N there, $p \in Q_n$ will not be contained in N anymore. But the argument still works since $p \in N$ implies $\delta(p) \in N$ and so $\text{sup}(N)$ can be added to the support of p .

Lemma 3.4. $\leq, \leq^*$ are partial orders on Q_n .

Lemma 3.5. For every $\gamma < \kappa_n^{+n+2}$ $p \in Q_n$ with $\text{supp}(p) \neq \emptyset$ there are $\gamma' > \gamma$ and $q \geq^* p$ with $\gamma' \in \text{supp}(q)$.

Lemma 3.6. Q_n has a dense set isomorphic to the forcing of Cohen subset to κ_n^{+n+2} .

Lemma 3.7. $\langle Q_n, \leq^* \rangle$ is κ_n -closed.

Lemma 3.8. $\langle Q_n, \leq, \leq^* \rangle$ satisfies the Prikry condition.

Let us now put all Q_n 's together.

Definition 3.9. A set of forcing conditions $\mathcal{P}$ consists of all elements p of the form

$$\langle p_n \mid n < \omega \rangle$$

so that

- (1) $p_n \in Q_n$ ($n < \omega$)
- (2) there is $\ell < \omega$ such that for every $n \geq \ell$ $\text{supp}(p_n) \neq \emptyset$.

Further let us call the least such ℓ the length of p and denote it by $\ell(p)$.

The definition of the ordering $\leq, \leq^*$ on $\mathcal{P}$ is the usual definition of the order of a product.

The proofs of the following lemmas are direct generalizations of those in [Git-Mag1].

Lemma 3.10. For every $f \in \prod_{n < \omega} \kappa_n^{+n+2}$ and $p \in \mathcal{P}$ there are $g \in \prod_{n < \omega} \kappa_n^{+n+2}$ $g > f$ and $q \in \mathcal{P}$ s.t. $q^* \geq p$ and for every $n \geq \ell$ $g(n) \in \text{supp}(p_n)$.

Lemma 3.11. $\langle \mathcal{P}, \leq \rangle$ satisfies κ_ω^{++} -c.c.

Lemma 3.12. $\langle \mathcal{P}, \leq^* \rangle$ is κ_0 -closed and for every $n < \omega, p \in \mathcal{P}$ with $\ell(p) \geq n$ $\langle \{q \in \mathcal{P} \mid q \geq p\}, \leq^* \rangle$ is κ_n -closed.

Lemma 3.13. $\langle \mathcal{P}, \leq, \leq^* \rangle$ satisfies the Prikry condition.

Let $G \subset \mathcal{P}$ be generic. For $f \in \prod_{n < \omega} \kappa_n^{+n+2}$, $f \in V$ let us denote by $G^f = \langle p^{f(n)} \mid n < \omega, p \in G \rangle$.

Lemma 3.14. For every $g \in (\prod_{n < \omega} \kappa_n^{+n+2}) \cap V$ there is $f \in (\prod_{n < \omega} \kappa_n^{+n+2}) \cap V$ $f > g$ such that G^f is a Prikry sequence.

The proof follows from Lemma 3.10.

Lemma 3.15. If $f_1, f_2 \in (\prod_{n < \omega} \kappa_n^{+n+2}) \cap V$ $f_1 < f_2$ and G^{f_1}, G^{f_2} are both Prikry sequences, then for all but finitely many n 's $G^{f_1}(n) < G^{f_2}(n)$.

Proof: There is a condition $p \in G$ such that for every $n \geq \ell(p)$ $f_1(n), f_2(n) \in \text{supp}(p)$. The rest follows from the definition of nice sequence. $\square$

Lemma 3.16. For every $f \in (\prod_{n < \omega} \kappa_n^{+n+2}) \cap V$ there is a Prikry sequence.

Proof: Pick $f^* > f$ such that G^{f^*} is Prikry and for all but finitely many n 's $f^*(n) \geq f(n)$. Then $\langle \pi_{n, f^*(n), f(n)}(G^{f^*}(n)) \mid n < \omega \rangle$ will be such a sequence. $\square$

4. Projection of Q_n

Our aim is to define a projection of $\mathcal{P}$ to a less rigid p.o. set which still produces all the Prikry sequences that $\mathcal{P}$ does.

Let us split $\mathcal{P}$ back and deal first with Q_n 's ($n < \omega$).

Fix $n < \omega$. For a while we'll drop the lower index n , i.e. $Q_n = Q$, $\kappa_n = \kappa$ etc.

Pick some $\alpha_0 \neq \alpha_1 < \kappa^{n+2}$ realizing the same type over κ^{+n} in sense of Section 1.

The automorphisms we are going to construct will move the condition

$$\langle \{ < 0, < \gg, < \alpha_0, < \gg \} , \quad \{ 0, \alpha_0 \}, \kappa \rangle$$

to the condition

$$\langle \{ \langle 0, \langle \rangle, \langle \alpha_1 \rangle \}, \{0, \alpha_1\}, \kappa \rangle .$$

Since $U_{\alpha_0} = U_{\alpha_1}$, we can extend this to conditions of the form

$$\langle \{ \langle 0, \langle \rangle, \langle \alpha_i \rangle \} , \{0, \alpha_i\} , A \rangle$$

for every $A \in U_{\alpha_i}$ ($i < 2$). Also let us move this way one element Prikry sequences, i.e. $\langle \{ \langle 0, p^0 \rangle, \langle \alpha_0, p^{\alpha_0} \rangle \} \rangle$ maps on $\langle \{ \langle 0, p^0 \rangle, \langle \alpha_1, p^{\alpha_0} \rangle \} \rangle$.

The basic idea for further extensions is as follows. Let $\beta_0 < \kappa^{+n+2}$ be above α_0 in the projection ordering $\leq_n$. Consider the extension of $\langle \{ \langle 0, \langle \rangle, \langle \alpha_0 \rangle \}, \{0, \alpha_0\}, \kappa \rangle$ it generates i.e.

$$\langle \{ \langle 0, \langle \rangle, \langle \alpha_0 \rangle, \langle \beta_0 \rangle \}, \{0, \alpha_0, \beta_0\}, \kappa \rangle .$$

We would like to pick some β_1 similar to β_0 and to map the last condition onto

$$\langle \{ \langle 0, \langle \rangle, \langle \alpha_1 \rangle, \langle \beta_1 \rangle \}, \{0, \alpha_1, \beta_1\}, \kappa \rangle .$$

There are two problems with this. Firstly there may be no β_1 realizing the same type over α_1 as β_0 does over α_0 . The second is that there may be lots of β_1 's which are good candidates. In this case we should be careful not to pick two of them β'_1, β''_1 such that they have a common part which is mapped in different fashions to β_0 . This eventually may hide all Prikry sequences and leave us with a trivial forcing.

We shall inductively define an equivalence relation $\longleftrightarrow$ on a dense subset of Q so that for every $p, q \in Q$ if $p \longleftrightarrow q$ then for any $p' \geq p$ there are $p'' \geq p'$ and $q'' \geq q$ such that $p'' \longleftrightarrow q''$. Then we define a preorder $\rightarrow$ over Q which will combine $\leq$ and $\longleftrightarrow$. In particular if $p \leq q$ or there is $q' \leq q$ $p \longleftrightarrow q'$, then $p \rightarrow q$.

Let $\{ \langle p_i^0, p_i^1, p_i^2 \rangle \mid i < \kappa^{+n} \}$ be an enumeration with unbounded repetitions of triples of Q so that

$$p_0^j = \langle \{ \langle 0, \langle \rangle, \langle \alpha_j \rangle \}, \{0, \alpha_j\}, \kappa \rangle$$

for $j < 2$ and $p_0^2 = p_0^0$.

Define $\longleftrightarrow$ by induction on $i < \kappa^{+n}$. For $i = 0$ let $p_0^0 \longleftrightarrow p_0^1$. Suppose that for every $i' < i$ the triple $\langle p_{i'}^0, p_{i'}^1, p_{i'}^2 \rangle$ was considered. If either (1) not $p_i^0 \longleftrightarrow p_i^1$ or (2) $p_i^0 \longleftrightarrow p_i^1$

and $p_i^2 \not\geq p_i^0$ then nothing new happened and we continue to the next triple. Suppose otherwise. Then $p_i^0 \longleftrightarrow p_i^1$, $p_i^2 \geq p_i^0$.

Case 1. $\text{supp}(p_i^0) = \text{supp}(p_i^2)$.

Let $\delta = \delta(p_i^2) + \delta(p_i^1) + 1$. Pick $p, q \in Q$ such that

- (a) $p \geq p_i^2$
- (b) $\text{supp}(p) = \text{supp}(p_i^2)$
- (c) $q \geq p_i^1$
- (d) $\text{supp}(q) = \text{supp}(p_i^1)$
- (e) $\delta(p) = \delta(q) \geq \delta + i$
- (f) for every $\gamma \in \delta(p) \setminus \delta(p_i^2)$, $\xi \in \delta(q) \setminus \delta(p_i^1)$.

$q^\xi, p^\gamma > \max(\kappa, \{t^\gamma \mid t \in Q \text{ appeared in the same triple before stage } i \text{ and } \gamma < \delta(t)\})$ and $q^\xi \neq p^\gamma$.

Set $p \longleftrightarrow q$.

Case 2. $\text{supp}(p_i^0) \neq \text{supp}(p_i^2)$.

Subcase 2.1. $\text{supp}(p_i^2) = \emptyset$ and $\delta(p_i^0) = \delta(p_i^1)$.

Then p_i^2 is obtained from p_i^0 by adding a one element sequence to $mc(p_i^0)$ and projecting it to the rest of $\text{supp}(p_i^0)$. Add this sequence to $mc(p_i^1)$ and project it to the rest of $\text{supp}(p_i^1)$. Let q be the condition obtained from p_i^1 this way. Set $p_i^2 \longleftrightarrow q$.

Subcase 2.2. $\text{supp}(p_i^2) = \emptyset$ and $\delta(p_i^0) < \delta(p_i^2)$.

Then we add $(p_i^2)^{mc(p_i^0)}$ to p_i^1 as a one element sequence at coordinate $mc(p_i^1)$ and project it to all the rest of $\text{supp}(p_i^1)$. Let q' be a condition obtained from p_i^1 using this process.

Now pick $p \geq p_i^1$ and $q \geq q'$ as in Case 1. Set $p \longleftrightarrow q$.

Subcase 2.3. $\text{supp}(p_i^2) \supsetneq \text{supp}(p_i^0)$.

Consider the type of $mc(p_i^2)$ over $mc(p_i^0)$. Let $\delta = \kappa + i + \sup\{t^\gamma + \delta(t) \mid t \in Q, \gamma < \delta(t) \text{ and } t \text{ or some condition which was defined to be equivalent to } t \text{ appeared before or at the stage } i\}$.

If there is some $\tau > \delta$ realizing the same type over $mc(p_i^1)$ as $mc(p_i^2)$ over $mc(p_i^0)$, then proceed as follows. Add τ to the support of p_i^1 and for every $\gamma, \delta(p_i^1) \leq \gamma < \tau$ add $\langle \delta \rangle$ to

coordinate γ . Let q be a condition obtained this way. Let $p = p_i^2 \cup \{\langle \gamma, \delta \rangle \mid \delta(p_i^2) \leq \gamma \leq \tau\}$. Set $p \longleftrightarrow q$.

Assume now that no $\tau > \delta$ realizes the same type over $mc(p_i^1)$ as $mc(p_i^2)$ does over $mc(p_i^0)$. Let $p = p_i^2 \cup \{\langle \gamma, \delta \rangle \mid \delta(p_i^2) \leq \gamma < \delta\}$ and $q = p_i^1 \cup \{\langle \gamma, \delta \rangle \mid \delta(p_i^1) \leq \gamma < \delta\}$. Consider $T(p)$ i.e. the set of $\mathcal{U}_{\kappa, mc(p)}$ measure one of p . For every $\nu \in T(p)$, denote by $p^\cap \langle \nu \rangle$ the extension p obtained by adding ν to the maximal coordinate of p and projecting it to every coordinate of $\text{supp}(p)$. We also consider $q^\cap(\pi_{mc(p), mc(p_i^0)}(\nu))$ which is defined similarly. Set

$$p^\cap \langle \nu \rangle \cup \{\langle \delta, \delta \rangle\} \longleftrightarrow q^\cap(\pi_{mc(p), mc(p_i^0)}(\nu)) \cup \{\langle \delta, \nu \rangle\}.$$

This completes the definition of $\longleftrightarrow$.

Notice that always $p \longleftrightarrow q$ implies $\delta(p) = \delta(q)$

Let $D = \{p \in Q \mid \exists q \in Q \ p \longleftrightarrow q\}$.

Lemma 4.1. *D is dense in $\langle Q, \leq \rangle$.*

Proof: Let $p \in Q$. Extend it to some t stronger than p_0^0 . Then the triple $\langle p_0^0, p_0^1, t \rangle$ appears at some stage i of the construction. Then either for some t' $t \longleftrightarrow t'$ or for some $t^* \geq t$ $t^* \longleftrightarrow t'$. $\square$

Lemma 4.2. *For every $p \in D$. If $q \neq q' \in D$ are such that $p \longleftrightarrow q$, $p \longleftrightarrow q'$. Then q, q' are incompatible.*

Proof: Suppose otherwise. Then let $i < j < \kappa^{+n}$ q_i, q_j be such that $p \longleftrightarrow q_i = q$, $p \longleftrightarrow q_j = q'$, q_i appeared at stage i and q_j at stage j . Since $i < j$ p is supposed to be really stronger or incompatible with every element appeared before stage j . But this includes p itself. Which is impossible. Contradiction. $\square$

Lemma 4.3. *Let $p, q \in D$ $p \longleftrightarrow q$ and $p \neq p_0^j$ for $j < 2$. Then p, q are incompatible.*

The proof follows from the definition of $\longleftrightarrow$.

Let D^* denote $D/\longleftrightarrow$. Define a preorder $\rightarrow$ over D^* and actually over Q .

Definition 4.4. $p \rightarrow q$ iff there exists $n < \omega$ and a sequence $\langle p_k \mid k < n \rangle$ so that

- (1) $p_0 = p$
- (2) $p_{n-1} = q$
- (3) for every $k < n - 1$

$$p_k \leq p_{k+1} \quad \text{or} \quad p_k \longleftrightarrow p_{k+1} .$$

See diagram:

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
 p_{n-2} & \longleftrightarrow & p_{n-1} \\
 \vee | & & \\
 p_{n-3} & \longleftrightarrow & p_{n-4} \\
 \dots & \dots & \dots \\
 \dots & \dots & \vee | \\
 p_4 & \longleftrightarrow & p_5 \\
 \vee | & & \\
 p_3 & \longleftrightarrow & p_2 \\
 & & \vee | \\
 p_0 & \longleftrightarrow & p_1
 \end{array}$$

Clearly $\rightarrow$ is reflexive and transitive.

Lemma 4.5. $\langle D^*, \rightarrow \rangle$ is a nice suborder of $\langle Q, \leq \rangle$, i.e. for every generic $G \subseteq Q$ $\{p/\longleftrightarrow \mid p \in G \cap D\}$ is a generic for $\langle D^*, \rightarrow \rangle$.

Proof: It is enough to show the following:

For every $E^* \subseteq D^*$ dense open in $\langle D^*, \rightarrow \rangle$ $E = \{p \in Q \mid p/\longleftrightarrow \in E^*\}$ is dense in $\langle Q, \leq \rangle$. So let $E^* \subseteq D^*$ be a dense open set and $s \in Q$. First we extend s to some $p \in D$. Then there is $q \in D$ such that $p \rightarrow q$ and $q/\longleftrightarrow \in E^*$. Let $\langle p_k \mid k < n \rangle$ be as in Definition 4.4. Assume for simplicity that $n = \infty$. At the first step find $p'_6 \geq p_6$ and $p'_4 \geq p_4$ so that $p'_6 \longleftrightarrow p'_4$. This is possible since the triple $\langle p_5, p_4, p_6 \rangle$ appears at some stage of the definition of $\longleftrightarrow$. See the diagram:

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc}
 & & & & p'_6 & & \\
 & & & & \vee | & & \\
 q = p_7 & \longleftrightarrow & p_6 & & & & \\
 & & \vee | & & & & \\
 p''_4 \geq p'_4 \geq p_4 & \longleftrightarrow & p_5 & & & & \\
 & & \vee | & & & & \\
 & & p_3 & \longleftrightarrow & p_2 & \leq & p''_2 \leq p'''_2 \\
 & & & & \vee | & & \\
 p'''_0 \geq p = p_0 & \longleftrightarrow & p_1 & & & &
 \end{array}$$

Then we shall find $p_4'' \geq p_4'$ and $p_2'' \geq p_2$ such that $p_2'' \longleftrightarrow p_4''$. They exist by the same reason. And finally we pick equivalent $p_0''' \geq p_0 = p$ and $p_2''' \geq p_2''$. Now, as $q/\longleftrightarrow \in E^*$, $p_6 \longleftrightarrow q$ and $p_6' \geq p_6$, $p_6'/\longleftrightarrow \in E^*$. Then $p_4'/\longleftrightarrow \in E^*$ and therefore $p_4''/\longleftrightarrow$. This implies $p_2''/\longleftrightarrow \in E^*$ and then $p_2'''/\longleftrightarrow \in E^*$. But then $p_0'''/\longleftrightarrow \in E^*$. Therefore $p_0''' \in E$ and we are done. $\square$

The same proof gives the following.

Lemma 4.6. *For every $p \in Q$ the set $\{q \mid p \leq q \text{ or } p, q \text{ are } \rightarrow \text{ incompatible}\}$ and is dense in $\langle Q, \leq \rangle$.*

Let $p \in Q$ be a condition with $\text{supp}(p) \neq \emptyset$. For $\nu \in T(p)$, (recall that $T(p)$ is a set of measure one corresponding to the maximal coordinate of p) let us denote by $p^\cap \langle \nu \rangle$ the condition obtained from p by adding ν to the maximal coordinate of p and projecting it to all permitted for ν coordinates in $\text{supp}(p)$.

Suppose $p, q \in Q$, $\text{supp } p \neq \emptyset$, $\text{supp } q \neq \emptyset$ and $p \longrightarrow q$. Let $\vec{p} = \langle p_k \mid k < n \rangle$ be a sequence witnessing $p \longrightarrow q$. Let $\gamma \in \text{supp } p$. We define the orbit of γ via $\vec{p}$ as follows: $\gamma_0 = \gamma$, γ_1 the coordinate of p_1 corresponding to γ_0 , for every $0 < k < n$ let γ_k be the coordinate corresponding to γ_{k-1} in p_k . Let us call γ_{n-1} the $\vec{p}$ -image of γ in q .

The principal point will be to show that $\vec{p}$ -image of γ in q actually does not depend on a sequence $\vec{p}$ witnessing $p \longrightarrow q$. This implies, in particular that if $p \leq q$, then the only image of γ in q is γ itself. Which in turn implies that Prikry sequence are produced by $\langle Q, \longrightarrow \rangle$, since then for different ν_1, ν_2 $p^\cap \langle \nu_1 \rangle$ and $p^\cap \langle \nu_2 \rangle$ are incompatible in $\langle Q, \longrightarrow \rangle$.

Lemma 4.7. *Let $p \longrightarrow q$ $\text{supp } p, \text{supp } q \neq \emptyset$ and $\gamma \in \text{supp } p$. Then the image of γ in q does not depend on a particular sequence witnessing $p \longrightarrow q$.*

Proof: Suppose otherwise. Let us pick q with $\delta(q)$ as small as possible so that $p \longrightarrow q$, $\text{supp}(q) \neq \emptyset$ and for some $\gamma \in \text{supp}(p)$ image of γ in q depends on particular sequence witnessing $p \longrightarrow q$. Pick two sequences of the least possible lengths $\vec{s} = \langle s_i \mid i < s^* < \omega \rangle$ and $\vec{t} = \langle t_i \mid i < t^* < \omega \rangle$ witnessing $p \longrightarrow q$ and such that $\vec{s}$ -image of γ in q is different from $\vec{t}$ -image of γ in q .

W.l. of g . $q = s_{s^*-1} > s_{s^*-2}$ or $q = t_{t^*-1} > t_{t^*-2}$. Since, otherwise, $q \longleftrightarrow s_{s^*-2}$ and $q \longleftrightarrow t_{t^*-2}$. But by the construction of $\longleftrightarrow$ the above implies $s_{s^*-2} = t_{t^*-2}$ and

we can then replace q by s_{s^*-2} reducing the lengths of the witnessing sequences. Notices that it is impossible to have both $q > s_{s^*-2}$ and $q > t_{t^*-2}$. Since then by the definition of Q $s_{s^*-2} \geq t_{t^*-2}$ or $t_{t^*-2} \geq s_{s^*-2}$ (we are ignoring sets of measure). Let $s_{s^*-2} \geq t_{t^*-2}$. Then $p \longleftrightarrow s_{s^*-2}\gamma$ has different images in s_{s^*-2} and $\delta(s_{s^*-2}) < \delta(q)$. So let us assume that $q > s_{s^*-2}$ and $q \longleftrightarrow t_{t^*-2}$. Denote s_{s^*-2} by s and t_{t^*-2} by t . Consider the stage in the construction of $\longleftrightarrow$ where q and t were made equivalent. Suppose it was at a stage i . So the triple $\langle p_{i0}, p_{i1}, p_{i2} \rangle$ were considered. Since $\delta(q) > \delta(s_k), \delta(t_\ell)$ for every $k \leq s^* - 2, \ell \leq \ell^* - 3$, the equivalences inside the sequences $\langle s_k \mid k < s^* - 1 \rangle$ and $\langle t_\ell \mid \ell < t^* - 2 \rangle$ were obtained on earlier stages.

We claim that for some $j < 2$ $p_{ij} \geq s$ (once again we are ignoring sets of measure one in the condition considered). Since otherwise the definition of $\longleftrightarrow$ will make q incompatible with s . By the same reason for $j < 2$ $p_{ij} \geq t_{t^*-3}$. But γ is already embedded into s and t_{t^*-3} it is embedded into p_{i0} and p_{i1} . Also $p_{00} \longleftrightarrow p_{01}$ and $\delta(p_{00}) = \delta(p_{01}) < \delta(q)$. Hence picking p_{00} or p_{01} instead q we obtain a contradiction to the minimality of $\delta(q)$. $\square$

5. The projection of $\mathcal{P}$

Basically we are going to now put together the projections defined in the previous section for each $n < \omega$.

Add the lower index n to everything defined in Section 3, i.e. $\alpha_{0n}, \alpha_{1n}, D_n, D_n^*, \longleftrightarrow_n, \rightarrow_n$. Set $D = \{p \in \mathcal{P} \mid \text{for every } n \ p \restriction Q_n \in D_n\}$. Denote $p \restriction Q_n$ by p_n .

Let $p, q \in Q$ and $p \longleftrightarrow_n q$. Suppose that $\text{supp}(p) \neq \emptyset$. Then for some $k < \omega$ $mc(p_n), mc(q_n)$ are realizing the same type over κ_n^{+k+2} . We denote this by $p \longleftrightarrow_{n,k} q$.

Definition 5.1. Let $p, q \in D$. Then $p \longleftrightarrow q$ iff

- (1) for every $n < \omega$ $p_n \longleftrightarrow_n q_n$
- (2) there is a nondecreasing sequence $\langle k_n \mid n < \omega \rangle, \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} k_n = \infty$ such that for every $n \geq \ell(p)$ $p_n \longleftrightarrow_{n,k_n} q_n$.

Clearly, $\longleftrightarrow$ is an equivalence relation on D . Set $D^* = D / \longleftrightarrow$. Let us now turn to the ordering $\rightarrow$ on D^* . For $p, q \in Q_n$ $p \rightarrow_n q$ with $\text{supp}(q) \neq \emptyset$ let us denote by $p \rightarrow_{n,k} q$ the fact of existence of a sequence witnessing $p \rightarrow_n q$ such that the equivalent members are at least $\longleftrightarrow_{n,k}$ equivalent.

Definition 5.2. Let $p, q \in D$. Then $p \rightarrow q$ iff there is a finite sequence of conditions $\langle r_k \mid k < m < \omega \rangle$ so that

- (1) $r_0 = p$
- (2) $r_{m-1} = q$
- (3) for every $k < m - 1$ $r_k \leq r_{k+1}$ or $r_k \longleftrightarrow r_{k+1}$, or schematically:

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
 r_{m-2} & \longleftrightarrow & r_{m-1} = q \\
 \vee | & & \\
 r_{m-3} & \longleftrightarrow & r_{m-4} \\
 & \dots & \\
 & & \vee | \\
 r_4 & \longleftrightarrow & r_5 \\
 \vee | & & \\
 r_3 & \longleftrightarrow & r_2 \\
 & & \vee | \\
 p = r_0 & \longleftrightarrow & r_1
 \end{array}$$

Lemma 5.2.1. Let $p, q \in D$. If $p \rightarrow q$ then

- (1) for every $n < \omega$ $p_n \rightarrow_n q_n$
- (2) there is a nondecreasing sequence $\langle k_n \mid n < \omega \rangle$, $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} k_n = \infty$ such that for every $n \geq \ell(q)$ $p_n \rightarrow_{n, k_n} q_n$.

Proof: Let $\langle r_k \mid k < m \rangle$ be a sequence witnessing $p \rightarrow q$. Then for every $k < m - 1$ $r_k \leq r_{k+1}$ or $r_k \longleftrightarrow r_{k+1}$. In the latter case there exists a nondecreasing sequence $\langle \ell_{k,n} \mid n < \omega \rangle$ $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \ell_{k,n} = \infty$ such that for every $n \geq \ell(r_k)$ $r_{k,n} \longleftrightarrow_{n, \ell_{k,n}} r_{k+1,n}$. Set $\ell_n = \min\{\ell_{k,n} \mid k < m\}$ for every $n < \omega$. Then $\langle \ell_n \mid n < \omega \rangle$ is a nondecreasing sequence converging to infinity. Also, for every $n \geq \ell(q)$ $p_n \rightarrow_{n, \ell_n} q_n$. Since $\langle r_{k,n} \mid k < m \rangle$ be a witnessing sequence for this. $\square$

Lemma 5.2.2. D is a dense subset of $\mathcal{P}$.

Proof: Let $p \in \mathcal{P}$. Triples $\langle p_{0,n}^0, p_{0,n}^1, p_n^2 \rangle$ appear in enumerations of Q_n 's ($n < \omega$). So for each n there will be $p'_n \geq_n p_n$ in D_n . So the natural candidate for $q \geq p$ in D is $\langle p'_n \mid n < \omega \rangle$. The only problem is that by the definition of $\mathcal{P}$, starting some $\ell < \omega$ the supports of p'_n 's are supposed to be nonempty.

Consider $\ell(p)$ (the least $\ell < \omega$ s.t. $\text{supp}(p_n) \neq \emptyset$ for every $n \geq \ell$). Let $n \geq \ell(p) + 2$. Since $\alpha_{0,n}, \alpha_{1,n}$ are realizing the same type over κ_n^{+n} , there will be arbitrarily large (below

κ_n^{+n+2}) β 's realizing over $\alpha_{1,n}$ the same κ_n^{+n-1} -type as $mc(p_n)$ does over $\alpha_{0,n}$. So, we are in the situation of Subcase 2.2. of the definition $\longleftrightarrow_n$. Hence $p'_n \geq p_n$ with $\text{supp}_n p'_n = \text{supp } p_n$ is picked and added to D_n . This means that q consisting of such p'_n will be as desired. $\square$

Lemma 5.3. $\langle D^*, \rightarrow \rangle$ is a nice suborder of $\langle \mathcal{P} \leq \rangle$.

Proof: We proceed as in Lemma 4.5. Let $E^* \subseteq D^*$ be a dense open subset of $\langle D^*, \rightarrow \rangle$. We need to show that

$$E = \{p \in \mathcal{P} \mid p/\longleftrightarrow \in E^*\}$$

is dense in $\langle \mathcal{P}, \leq \rangle$. Let $s \in \mathcal{P}$. Extend it to some $p \in D$. Then for some $q \in D$ $p \rightarrow q$ and $q/\longleftrightarrow \in E^*$. For n 's below $\ell(q)$ we just repeat the argument of Lemma 4.5. For n 's above $\ell(q)$ pick a sequence $\langle k_n \mid n < \omega \rangle$ as in 5.2.1(2). So $p_n \rightarrow_{n,k_n} q_n$ for every $n \geq \ell(q)$. Consider the diagram like those of Lemma 4.5.

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc}
& & & & h' & & \\
& & & & \vee | & & \\
& & q_n & \longleftrightarrow_{n,k} & h & & \\
& & & & \vee | & & \\
f'' & \geq & f' & \geq & f & \longleftrightarrow_{n,k} & g \\
& & & & \vee | & & \\
& & d & \longleftrightarrow_{n,k} & c & \leq & c'' \leq c''' \\
& & & & \vee | & & \\
a''' & \geq & p_n & = & a & \longleftrightarrow_{n,k} & b
\end{array}$$

We can find $f' \longleftrightarrow_{n,k-1} h'$ since $g \longleftrightarrow_{n,k} f$ and $h \geq g$. So there are arbitrarily large $\xi < \kappa_n^{+n+2}$ realizing the same $\kappa_n^{+(k+2)-1}$ -type over $mc(f)$ as $mc(h)$ realizes over $mc(g)$. Applying this to the triple $\langle g, f, h \rangle$ we obtain such f', h' . Now the same argument for $\langle d, c, f' \rangle$ produces $f'' \longleftrightarrow_{n,k-1} c''$ and, finally, we reach $a''' \longleftrightarrow_{n,k-1} c'''$ with $a''' \geq p_n$.

Notice that $q_n \xrightarrow[n,k-1]{} a'''$. Since

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
a''' & \xleftrightarrow[n,k-1]{} & c''' \\
& & \vee | \\
f'' & \xleftrightarrow[n,k-1]{} & c'' \\
& & \vee | \\
f' & \xleftrightarrow[n,k-1]{} & h' \\
& & \vee | \\
q_n & \xleftrightarrow[n,k]{} & h
\end{array}$$

Denote a''' by p_n^* .

Doing this analyses for every n we obtain a condition $\langle p_n^* \mid n < \omega \rangle = p^*$ such that $p^* \in D$, $p^* \geq p$ and $q \longrightarrow p^*$. Hence $p^* / \longleftrightarrow \in E^*$ and so $p^* \in E$. $\square$

6. Extensions of Elementary Submodels in the Forcing With $\mathcal{P}$

Let N be an elementary submodel of a large enough piece of the universe of cardinality at most κ_ω . Let G be a generic subset of $\langle \mathcal{P}, \leq \rangle$ or of the projection of it defined in Section 4. We like to have $N[G]$ close to N . More specific, we like $N[G]$ to have the same ordinals as N and to be closed under ω -sequences. Unfortunately, it is impossible to achieve. Thus, if $N[G]$ is ω -closed then $|N| < \kappa_\omega$ and then G will add new ordinals to N .

The compromise will be to deal with N 's of cardinality κ_ω together with its elementary submodel N^* so that

- (1) $\cup(N^* \cap \kappa_\omega^+) = \cup(N \cap \kappa_\omega^+)$
- (2) for every $n < \omega$ $\cup(N^* \cap \kappa_n^{+n+2}) = \cup(N^*[G] \cap \kappa_n^{+n+2})$
- (3) ${}^\omega N^*[G] \subseteq N^*[G]$.

Let us turn to the definition.

Definition 6.1. A model N is called a good model iff

- (1) $N \cap \kappa_\omega^+$ is an ordinal.
- (2) there exists an increasing continuous sequence of submodels $\langle N_i \mid i \leq \delta \rangle$ with $N_\delta = N$ such that
 - (2a) $\langle N_i \mid i < j \rangle \in N_{j+1}$ for every $j < \delta$

- (2b) $\bigcup_{i < \delta} N_i = N$
- (2c) $\kappa_0 > cf\delta = \delta > \aleph_0, \delta^\omega = \delta$
- (3) there exists an increasing continuous sequence of submodels $\langle N_i^* \mid i \leq \delta \rangle$ of N (the same δ as in (1)) such that
 - (3a) $\langle N_i^* \mid i < j \rangle \in N_{j+1}^*$
 - (3b) $\delta = |N_i^*|$ for every $i < \delta$
 - (3c) ${}^\omega N_{i+1}^* \subseteq N_{i+1}^*$ for every $i < \delta$
 - (3d) $\{N_i\} \cup \delta \subseteq N_{i+1}^* \subseteq N_{i+2}$ for every $i < \delta$
 - (3e) $\cup(N_\delta^* \cap \kappa_\omega^+) = \cup(N \cap \kappa_\omega^+)$.

Further we call $\ll N_i \mid i < \delta \gg, \langle N_i^* \mid i \leq \delta \gg$ a good sequence for N and denote N_δ^* simply by N^* . Let us refer, also, to $\langle N, N^* \rangle$ as to a good pair. For the main results in the next section only N^* will be important.

For a generic $G \subseteq \mathcal{P}$ and a model N , we mean by $N[G]$ the set $\{\tau[G] \mid \tau \in N, \tau \text{ is a name}\}$.

Lemma 6.2. *Let D be a $*$ -dense open subset of $\mathcal{P}$, (i.e. dense open in $\langle \mathcal{P}, \leq^* \rangle$) then for every $n < \omega$ there are $D_n \subseteq \mathcal{P} \restriction n+1$, $D^n \subseteq \mathcal{P} \setminus n$ such that*

- (a) D^n is κ_n -weakly closed.
- (b) $D \times D^n \subseteq D$
- (c) $D_n \times D^n$ is $*$ -dense in $\mathcal{P}$.

The proof follows from Lemma 3.12, since $|\mathcal{P} \restriction n+1| < \kappa_{n+1}$.

Definition 6.3. A condition $p \in \mathcal{P}$ is called $*$ -generic for a pair of models $\langle N, N^* \rangle$ iff for every $\mathcal{P}$ -names τ, τ^* of ordinals such that $\tau \in N, \tau^* \in N^*$ p forces in the forcing $\langle \mathcal{P}, \leq^* \rangle$ “ $\tau[\tilde{G}] \in N, \tau^*[\tilde{G}] \in N^*$ ”.

Lemma 6.4. *Let $\langle N, N^* \rangle$ be a good pair. Then there is a $*$ -generic condition for $\langle N, N^* \rangle$.*

Proof: Let $\langle N_i \mid i \leq \delta \rangle, \langle N_i^* \mid i \leq \delta \rangle$ be sequences witnessing the goodness of the pair $\langle N, N^* \rangle$. Let $\langle D_{i,j} \mid j < \kappa_\omega \rangle, \langle E_{i,j} \mid j < |N_i^*| \rangle$ be enumerations of $*$ -dense open sets of N_i

and N_i^* respectively. For every j , $\kappa_n \leq j < \kappa_{n+1}$. Using Lemma 6.3, replace each $D_{i,j}$ by product $D'_{i,j} \times D''_{i,j}$ with $D''_{i,j}$ κ_{n+2} -weakly closed.

W.l. of g . let us assume that for every $i < \delta$ $\langle D_{i,j} \mid j < \kappa_\omega \rangle$, $\langle E_{i,j} \mid j < |N_i^*| \rangle$ belong to N_{i+1}^* .

We define now by induction a $*$ -increasing sequence of conditions $\langle p_i \mid i \leq \delta \rangle$. Let us describe only the first stage of the construction, since each successor stage will be like this and at limit stages the union will be taken.

Pick $q \in N_1^*$ such that for every $j < \kappa_\omega$, $\kappa_n \leq j < \kappa_{n+1}$ q belongs to D''_{0j} . Let $p_1 \geq^* q$, $p_1 \in N_2$ be such that $p_1 \in \bigcap_{j < |N_0^*|} E_{0j}$.

Let us show that $p = p_\delta$ is a $*$ -generic for $\langle N, N^* \rangle$. There is no problem with N^* , since it meets each $*$ -dense set of N^* . Let τ be a name of ordinal in N . Then for some $i < \delta$ $\tau \in N_i$. Let $D = \{q \in \mathcal{P} \mid q \text{ decides the value of } \tau \text{ in the forcing } \langle \mathcal{P}, \leq^* \rangle\}$. Then for some $j < \kappa_\omega$ $D \supseteq D'_{ij} \times D''_{ij}$. Pick $n < \omega$ so that $\kappa_n \leq j < \kappa_{n+1}$. By the choice of p , $p \geq p_{i+1}$ and p_{i+1} is in D''_{ij} . Since $D'_{ij} \subseteq \mathcal{P} \restriction n+1$, $|D'_{ij}| < \kappa_{n+1}$. So $D'_{ij} \subseteq N_i$. Then p forces in $\langle \mathcal{P}, \leq^* \rangle$ $\tau[G] \in N_i$. $\square$

Now let us turn to the real forcing, i.e. $\langle \mathcal{P}, \leq \rangle$.

Lemma 6.5. *Let N be a good model and $p \in \mathcal{P}$ be $*$ -generic over N . Then p forces in $\langle \mathcal{P}, \leq \rangle$*

$$''N[G] \cap On = N \cap On'' .$$

Proof: Let $\tau \in N$ be a name of an ordinal. By Lemma 3.13, for every $q \in \mathcal{P}$ there is $q' \geq^* q$ and $\omega > n \geq \ell(q')$ such that the extension of q' obtained by adding an element of Prikry sequence of $mc(q'_n)$ already decides the value of τ . Certainly, this value may depend on particular element added, but Prikry sequence consists of elements below κ_ω and in our case even below κ_n . So, if $q' \in N$ then every such extension is in N as well. Hence $\tau[G] \in N$.

Let us show that it is possible to find such $q' \in N$ below p . Let D be a dense open set of conditions of this type. Then, for some $i < \delta$ $D \in N_i$ where δ , N_i are as in the definition of a good model. Now split D into $D'_{ij} \times D''_{ij}$ and proceed as in Lemma 6.4. $\square$

Let us turn to N^* now. Suppose that $\langle N, N^* \rangle$ is a good pair and $p \in \mathcal{P}$ is $*$ -generic

for $\langle N, N^* \rangle$. Consider $\langle mc_n(p) \mid n \geq \ell(p) \rangle$, the sequence of maximal coordinates of p and $\langle A_n \mid n \geq \ell(p) \rangle$ the sequence of corresponding sets of measures one. By the choice of p and Lemma 3.13, for every $\mathcal{P}$ -name $\tau \in N^*$ of an ordinal there is $n, \omega > n \geq \ell(p)$ such that for every $\nu \in A_n$, $p^\cap \langle \nu \rangle$ decides τ , where $p^\cap \langle \nu \rangle$ is the extension of p obtained by adding ν to $mc_n(p)$ and projecting ν to coordinates in $\text{supp}_n(p)$.

For a generic $G \subseteq \mathcal{P}$, set $N^*[G] = \{\tau[G] \mid \tau \in N^*\}$. Let $\langle N_i^* \mid i < \delta \rangle$ be a sequence witnessing goodness of N^* . By Lemma 6.4, p can be chosen to be a supremum of $\langle p_i \mid i < \delta \rangle$ so that each p_i is $*$ -generic over N_i^* and $p_i \in N_{i+1}^*$. Suppose that this is the case.

Lemma 6.6. *Let $\lambda \in N^*$ be a regular cardinal and suppose that $\lambda \notin \{\kappa_n \mid n < \omega\}$. Then for every generic $G \subseteq \mathcal{P}$ with $p \in G$*

$$\cup(N^*[G] \cap \lambda) = \cup(N^* \cap \lambda) .$$

Proof: Let $\tau \in N^*$ be a name of an ordinal less than λ . Find $i < \lambda$ such that $\tau \in N_i^*$. Since p_i is $*$ -generic for N_i^* , there will be $n, \ell(p_i) \leq n < \omega$ and a set of measure one A_{in} in p_i corresponding to $mc_n(p_i)$ such that for every $\nu \in A_{in}$ $p_i^\cap \langle \nu \rangle$ decides the value of τ . But $p_i \in N_{i+1}^* \subseteq N^*$. So, there will be some ordinal $\tau^* \in N^* \cap \lambda$ which will bound all the possibilities for the value of τ . $\square$

Remark 6.7. The same argument works for every limit $i < \delta$.

Lemma 6.8. *Let G be a generic subset of $\mathcal{P}$ with $p \in G$. Then ${}^\omega N^*[G] \subseteq N^*[G]$.*

Proof: It is enough to show that for every $i < \delta$

$${}^\omega N_i^*[G] \subseteq N_{i+1}^*[G] .$$

Let $i < \delta$. By Definition 5.1, $|N_i^*| = \delta$, $N_i^* \in N_{i+1}^*$, $\delta \subseteq N_{i+1}^*$, $\delta < \kappa_0$ and $\delta^\omega = \omega$. Then $|{}^\omega N_i^*[G]| = \delta$. Since $|N_i^*[G]| = \delta$ and $\delta^\omega = \delta$ in a generic extension as well. But $N_{i+1}^*[G]$ is an elementary submodel of $V_\lambda[G]$ for λ big enough. So ${}^\omega N_i^*[G] \subseteq N_{i+1}^*[G]$. $\square$

7. Extensions of Elementary Submodels in the Projection Forcing

Let $\langle D^*, \rightarrow \rangle$ the suborder of $\langle \mathcal{P}, \leq \rangle$ defined in Section 4. Denote by π the corresponding projection.

Lemma 7.1. *Let $\langle N, N^* \rangle$ be a good pair, $p \in \mathcal{P}$ a $*$ -generic for $\langle N, N^* \rangle$ and $G \subseteq \mathcal{P}$ generic subset with $p \in G$. Then*

- (1) $N^*[G] \cap V \supseteq N^*[\pi''(G)] \cap V$.
- (2) ${}^\omega N^*[\pi''(G)] \subseteq N^*[\pi''(G)]$.

Proof: (1) holds since $G, \pi \in N^*[G]$. For (2) just repeat the argument of Lemma 6.8. $\square$

Let $\langle N_i^* \mid i < \delta \rangle$ be a sequence witnessing goodness of N^* . By Lemma 6.4 it is possible to pick a $*$ -generic p over N^* to be a supremum of $\langle p_i \mid i < \delta \rangle$ so that each p_i is $*$ -generic over N_i^* and $p_i \in N_{i+1}^*$.

Let us denote by $\mathcal{P} \restriction p$ the set of conditions $\{q \in \mathcal{P} \mid \text{all the coordinates of } q \text{ are already mentioned in } p\}$.

Lemma 7.2. *$N^*[G] \cap V$ and $N^*[\pi''G] \cap V$ depend only on $G \cap \mathcal{P} \restriction p$.*

Proof: Let $\tau \in N^*$ be a name of an element of V . Then for some $i < \delta$ $\tau \in N_i^*$. Since p_i is $*$ -generic for N_i^* , there will be n , $\ell(p_i) \leq n < \omega$ and a set measure one A_{in} in p_i corresponding to $mc_n(p_i)$ such that for every $\nu \in A_{in}$ $p_i^\cap \langle \nu \rangle$ decides the value of τ . But then there will be $q \in G \cap \mathcal{P} \restriction p_i$ $q \geq p_i^\cap \langle \nu \rangle$ for some ν . This q will decide τ . $\square$

Lemma 7.2.1. *$N^*[G] \cap V = N^*[\pi''(G)] \cap V$.*

Proof: Let $\tau \in N^*$ be a name of element of V . As in 7.2, there are $i < \delta$ and A_{in} such that $p_i \cap \langle \nu \rangle$ decides the value of τ for every $\nu \in A_{in}$. The point is that $\langle p_i^\cap \langle \nu \rangle \mid \nu \in A_{in} \rangle$ remains a maximal antichain above p_i also after projection. It follows from the definition of π . Now it is easy to replace τ by a name τ' depending only on $\langle p_i^\cap \langle \nu \rangle \mid \nu \in A_i \rangle$ and it will be a name in the projection forcing a well. Now $\tau'[6] = \tau'[\pi''G]$. $\square$

Lemma 7.3. *For every $n \geq \ell(p)$*

$$\cup \text{supp}_n(p) = \cup (N^* \cap \kappa_n^{+n+2}) = \cup (\text{supp}_n(p) \cap N^*) .$$

Proof: For every $\alpha \in N^* \cap \kappa_n^{+n+2}$ there is $\beta \in N^* \cap \text{supp}_n(p)$, $\beta \geq \alpha$ since p is $*$ -generic for N^* . On the other hand, $\text{supp}_n(p) = \bigcup_{i < \delta} \text{supp}_n(p_i)$ and for every $i < \delta$ $p_i \in N^*$. Hence also $\cup \text{supp}_n(p_i) \in N^*$. $\square$

Lemma 7.4. *Let $n \geq \ell(p)$. For every $\alpha \in N^* \cap \kappa_n^{+n+2}$ there are $\beta, \gamma \in N^* \cap \text{supp}_n(p)$ such that β is the α -th member of C_γ , where C_γ is from the canonical box sequence for κ^{+n+2} .*

Proof: Follows from elementary of N^* and $*$ -genericity of p for N^* . $\square$

This lemma shows that we actually can recover Prikry sequences even for coordinates α which are occupied in p by irrelevant ordinals. So $\mathcal{P} \restriction p$ is actually the tree Prikry forcing where the measure including $N^* \cap \kappa_n^{+n+2}$ stands on the level n in the tree.

Let $t \in D^*$. Pick some good model N^* with $t \in N^*$. Let p be $*$ -generic over N^* and $t \leq p$. There is $p' \in D^*$ above p . Let $q' \in D^*$ $q' \longleftrightarrow p'$, $q' \neq p'$. Pick a good model $M^* \supseteq N^*$ with $q' \in M^*$. Let $r \geq q'$ be $*$ -generic over M^* . Pick $s, s' \in D^*$ such that $s' \longleftrightarrow s$, $s' \geq r$, $s \geq p'$.

Lemma 7.5. *Let H be a generic subset of $\langle D^*, \rightarrow \rangle$ with $s \in H$ (or equivalently $s' \in H$). Then*

- (1) *both $N^*[H], M^*[H]$ are elementary submodels of $V_\lambda[H]$*
- (2) *if G, G' are generic subsets of $\langle \mathcal{P}, \leq \rangle$ s.t. $\pi''G = \pi''G' = H$ and $s \in G, s' \in G'$. then*

$$N^*[G] \cap V = N^*[H] \cap V$$

$$M^*[G'] \cap V = M^*[H] \cap V.$$

- (3) *$\omega M^*[H] \subseteq M^*[H]$ and $\omega N^*[H] \subseteq N^*[H]$.*

Proof: (1) is trivial. (2), and (3) follow from 6.1. $\square$

Notice that since $q' \longleftrightarrow p'$ and $q' \neq p'$, $M^*[H]$ and $N^*[G]$ will disagree about a source of certain common Prikry sequence.

The final step will be to show that this implies a disagreement for indiscernibles as well. Let's fix $N^*, M^*, p, p', q', r, s, s'$ and H . Notice that $\{x \in \mathcal{P} \mid x \geq s \text{ and every coordinate of } x \text{ appears in } s\} \cap H$ is $\mathcal{P} \restriction s$ generic. Denote it by H_s and define $H_{s'}$ in the same fashion. Basically, we use H to give us a Prikry sequence for the maximal coordinates in s (or s'). Use $H_{s'}$ to generate a $\mathcal{P} \restriction r$ -generic set H_r in the same fashion. Let also H_s generates a $\mathcal{P} \restriction p$ -generic set H_p .

Combining Lemmas 7.2 and 7.5 we obtain the following.

Lemma 7.6.

- (a) $N^*[H] \cap V = N^*[H_p] \cap V$
- (b) $M^*[H] \cap V = M^*[H_r] \cap V$.

Sets H_p and H_r will be used below to produce winning strategies in games of the type of [Git2]. We'll show that H_p produces the least winning strategy for N^* and hence coincides with the assignment functions for indiscernibles of N^* . The same will be true about H_r and M^* .

Let us work in $V[H]$. We denote by $\langle c_n \mid n < \omega \rangle$ the Prikry sequence for normal measures over κ_n 's. Assume that $V = \mathcal{K}(\mathcal{F})$ the core model with the maximal sequence $\mathcal{F}$ of extenders. Let us recall the statement of the Covering Lemma.

Suppose that there is no inner model with a strong cardinal. Let $\mathcal{K}(\mathcal{F})$ be the core model.

The Mitchell Covering Lemma.

Let $X < H_\lambda$ (for some $\lambda \geq \kappa^+$) be such that

- (a) ${}^\omega X \subseteq X$
- (b) $|X| < \kappa$
- (c) $X \cap \kappa$ is cofinal in κ .

Let $\pi : N \simeq X$ be the transitive collapse. Denote $\pi^{-1}(\kappa)$ by $\bar{\kappa}$, $\pi^{-1}(\mathcal{F})$ by $\bar{\mathcal{F}}$.

Then there are

- (a) $\bar{\rho} < \bar{\kappa}$.
- (b) a $\bar{\mathcal{F}} \restriction \kappa$ -mouse $\bar{m}$
- (c) functions on triples of ordinals $\bar{C}, C$ subsets of $\bar{\kappa}$ and κ respectively
- (d) a $\mathcal{F} \restriction \kappa$ -mouse m
- (e) a map $\pi^* : \bar{m} \rightarrow m$ such that the following holds.
- (1) $\bar{m}$ is an iterated ultrapower of a $\bar{\mathcal{F}} \restriction \bar{\rho}$ -mouse and $\bar{C}$ is the set of indiscernibles for $\bar{m}$ corresponding to the iteration.
- (2) $H_{\bar{\kappa}}^{\bar{m}} = N \cap H_{\bar{\kappa}}^{\mathcal{K}(\bar{\mathcal{F}})}$

- (3) $\mathcal{P}(\bar{\kappa}) \cap \mathcal{K}(\bar{\mathcal{F}}) \cap N \subseteq \bar{m}$
- (4) $\pi^* \supseteq \pi \upharpoonright (H_{\bar{\kappa}})^{\mathcal{K}(\bar{\mathcal{F}})}$
- (5) for every $(\alpha, \beta, \gamma) \in \text{dom } \bar{C}$ $C(\pi^*(\alpha), \pi^*(\beta), \pi^*(\gamma)) = \pi''(\bar{C}(\alpha, \beta, \gamma))$ and $\text{dom } C = \pi^{*''} \text{dom } \bar{C}$
- (6) the canonical skolem function $\bar{h}$ for $\bar{m}$ maps to the canonical skolem function h for m .
- (7) $X \cap H_{\kappa} \cap \mathcal{K}(\mathcal{F}) = h''(\pi''(\bar{\rho}); C) \cap H_{\kappa}$
- (8) $X \cap \mathcal{P}(\kappa) \cap \mathcal{K}(\mathcal{F}) \subseteq h''(\pi''(\bar{\rho}); C)$
- (9) $H_{\kappa} \cap \mathcal{K}(\mathcal{F}) \subseteq m$.

Further we shall denote such C and h by C^X and h^X . Also we shall confuse C^X and $\cup\{C^X(\alpha, \beta, \gamma) \mid \alpha, \beta, \gamma \in \text{dom } C^X\}$. Elements of C are called indiscernibles.

Notice that (1),(5),(6) imply that if $c \in \text{rng } C^N$ then there is the unique triple $(\alpha^N(c), \beta^N(c), \gamma^N(c)) \in (h^N)''c$ such that $c \in C^N(\alpha^N(c), \beta^N(c), \gamma^N(c))$.

Let us now define a variant of the game introduced in [Git2].

The game $\mathcal{G}_{\chi}$ lasts $\leq \chi$ moves, where χ is an ordinal $< c_0$. Actually, it was used with $\chi = \omega_1 + 1$.

On stage δ Player I picks a sequence $\bar{B}_{\delta} = \langle B_{\delta n} \mid n < \omega \rangle$ such that

- (a) For every $n < \omega$ $B_{\delta n} \in \mathcal{K}(\mathcal{F})$, it is a subset of κ_n^{+n+2} of cardinality (in $\mathcal{K}(\mathcal{F})$) $\leq \kappa_n$.
- (b) There exists a function $g \in \mathcal{K}(\mathcal{F})$ such that for all (but finitely many n 's) $B_{\delta, n} \in g''(c_n)$.

Notice that a particular case of (b) is $\bar{B}_{\delta} = \langle B_{\delta, n} \mid n < \omega \rangle \in \mathcal{K}(\mathcal{F})$.

- (c) For every $n < \omega$ $B_{n, \delta} \supseteq \bigcup_{\delta' < \delta} B_{n, \delta'}$.

The answer of Player II is a sequence $\bar{\tau}^{\delta} = \langle \tau^{\delta}(n) \mid n < \omega \rangle$ so that the conditions below hold

- (1) For all but finitely many $n < \omega$ if $\langle \xi_i \mid i < \rho_{\delta n} \rangle$ is least in $\mathcal{K}(\mathcal{F})$ enumeration of $B_{\delta, n}$, where $\rho_{\delta, n} = \kappa_n$ or $\rho_{\delta, n} < \kappa_n$ then $\bar{\tau}^{\delta}(n) = \langle \tau^{\delta}(n, i) \mid i < \rho'_{\delta, n} \rangle$, where

$$\rho'_{\delta, n} = \begin{cases} c_n(\alpha_n) , & \text{if } \rho_{\delta, n} = \kappa_n \\ \rho_{\delta, n} , & \text{if } \rho_{\delta, n} < \kappa_n . \end{cases}$$

And for every $i, j < \rho'_n$

$$\tau^{\delta}(n, i) < \tau^{\delta}(n, j) \quad \text{iff} \quad \xi_i < \xi_j .$$

(2) For every $\delta' < \delta$ there is $n(\delta', \delta) < \omega$ such that for every $n \geq n(\delta', \delta)$

$$\{\tau^\delta(n, i) \mid i < \rho'_{\rho, n}\} \supseteq \{\tau^{\delta'}(n, j) \mid j < \rho'_{\delta', n}\}$$

and $\tau^\delta(n, i) = \tau^{\delta'}(n, j)$ implies that the i -th element of $B_{\delta, n}$ and the j -th element of $B_{\delta', n}$ are the same.

Player II loses if at some stage he has no legal moves.

The idea behind this definition is as follows. The first player picks indexes of measures and the second is supposed to find indiscernible (or what he thinks are indiscernibles) for these measures. Then the first player increases the set of indexes of measures and the second chooses indiscernibles for the bigger set. He is supposed to respect his previous choices almost everywhere. If he succeeds in going on long enough he wins.

Notice, that if Player I restricts himself to moves that are in some fixed model N , then II has a winning strategy. He just plays indiscernibles of N .

Let's use H_p to define a winning strategy σ for II in the game restricted to $N^*[H]$. The strategy will be positional, i.e. will depend only on the last move. So suppose that stage δ Player I plays a sequence $\overline{B}_\delta = \langle B_{\delta, n} \mid n < \omega \rangle \in N^*[H]$ such that each $B_{\delta, n} \in \mathcal{K}(\mathcal{F})$, is a subset of κ_n^{+n+2} of cardinality $\leq \kappa_n$ (in $\mathcal{K}(\mathcal{F})$ or equivalently in $V[H]$) and there is a function $g \in \mathcal{K}(\mathcal{F})$ such that for all but finitely many n 's $B_{\delta, n} \in g''(c_n)$. By elementarity of $N^*[H]$, we can assume that $g \in N^*$.

Lemma 7.7. $\langle B_{\delta, n} \mid n < \omega \rangle \in \mathcal{K}(\mathcal{F})$.

Proof: Let $g(\xi_n) = B_{\delta, n}$ for some $\xi_n < c_n$ and every $n < \omega$. Using the Prikry condition of $\mathcal{P} \restriction p$ and the fact that $\langle c_n \mid n < \omega \rangle$ is a Prikry sequence for normal measures, it is not hard to see that $\langle \xi_n \mid n < \omega \rangle \in N^*$. But then also $\langle B_{\delta, n} \mid n < \omega \rangle \in N^*$. $\square$

For every $n < \omega$ there is $\delta_n < \kappa_n^{+n+2}$ which codes $B_{\delta, n}$ in $\mathcal{K}(\mathcal{F})$. Thus take ρ_n to be the index of $B_{\delta, n}$ in $\mathcal{K}(\mathcal{F})$ – least enumeration of subsets of κ_n^{+n+2} of cardinality $\leq \kappa_n$. Then, clearly, $\langle \rho_n \mid n < \omega \rangle \in N^*$. We like $\sigma(\langle B_{\delta, n} \mid n < \omega \rangle)$ be the sequence obtained by decoding the Prikry sequence for the measures corresponding to $\langle \rho_n \mid n < \omega \rangle$. It may be the case that H_p just does not have such Prikry sequence. But then Lemma 7.4 will be used to produce one.

Lemma 7.8. *In $N^*[H]$ there is a Prikry sequence $\langle \chi_n \mid n < \omega \rangle$ for $\langle \rho_n \mid n < \omega \rangle$.*

Proof: Let $n \geq \ell(p)$. Since $\rho_n \in N^* \cap \kappa_n^{+n+2}$, by Lemma 7.4 there will be $\beta_n, \gamma_n \in N^* \cap \text{supp}_n(p)$ such that β_n is the ρ_n -th member of C_{γ_n} . Since $\beta_n, \gamma_n \in \text{supp}_n(p)$, there will be in H_p , ξ_n, ρ_n the elements of the one element Prikry sequence corresponding to measures of β_n, γ_n . Then for some χ_n , ξ_n will be χ_n -th element of C_{ρ_n} . Now, $\langle \chi_n \mid n \geq \ell(p) \rangle$ will be the desired Prikry sequence. $\square$

For every $n, \omega > n \geq \ell(p)$ let $\bar{\tau}^\delta(n)$ be the subset of c_n^{+n+2} with index χ_n in the $\mathcal{K}(\mathcal{F})$ -least enumeration of subsets of c_n^{+n+2} of cardinality $\leq c_n$. Finally we define $\sigma(\langle B_{\delta_n} \mid n < \omega \rangle) = \langle \bar{\tau}^\delta(n) \mid n < \omega \rangle$.

The choice of $\langle \chi_n \mid n < \omega \rangle$ insures that $\langle \bar{\tau}^\delta(n) \mid n < \omega \rangle$ is a legal move in the game, i.e. the conditions (1) and (2) of its definition are satisfied. This completes the definition of σ .

Let us call a strategy μ a least strategy if for every other strategy μ' , for every first move of Player I consisting of some ordinals $\langle \{\beta_n\} \mid n < \omega \rangle$ $\mu(\langle \{\beta_n\} \mid n < \omega \rangle)(\ell) \leq \mu'(\langle \{\beta_n\} \mid n < \omega \rangle)(\ell)$ for all but finitely many ℓ 's.

Lemma 7.9. *σ is the least possible winning strategy for games $\mathcal{G}_\chi$ restricted to $N^*[H]$ with $\chi > \omega_1$.*

Proof: Suppose otherwise. Let σ' be another strategy and suppose that for some sequence of ordinals $\bar{\beta} = \langle \beta_n \mid n < \omega \rangle$, $\beta_n < \kappa_n^{+n+2}$ ($n < \omega$)

$$\sigma'(\langle \{\beta_n\} \mid n < \omega \rangle) \not\leq \sigma(\langle \{\beta_n\} \mid n < \omega \rangle).$$

Denote $\sigma'(\langle \{\beta_n\} \mid n < \omega \rangle)$ by $\bar{\nu}^0 = \langle \nu^0(n) \mid n < \omega \rangle$ and $\sigma(\langle \{\beta_n\} \mid n < \omega \rangle)$ by $\bar{\tau}^\beta = \langle \tau^\beta(n) \mid n < \omega \rangle$. Assume for simplicity that for every $n < \omega$ $\tau^\beta(n) > \nu^0(n)$ and $\ell(p) = 0$.

We like to find now for each $n < \omega$ a measure to which $\nu^0(n)$ corresponds and then to proceed as in [Git2] toward the contradiction.

Fix $n < \omega$. Let $\underset{\sim}{\nu} \in N^*$ be a $\mathcal{P}$ -name of $\nu^0(n)$. Since p is $*$ -generic over N^* and $\nu^0(n) < \kappa_n^{+n+2}$, adding the Prikry sequence up to level n in p already decides the value of $\underset{\sim}{\nu}$. $\underset{\sim}{\nu}$ can be viewed as function of n variables and it will represent an ordinal $< \kappa_n^{+n+2}$ in

the iterated ultrapower by $mc_0(p), mc_1(p), \dots mc_n(p)$. This ordinal gives the index of the measure corresponding to $\nu_0(n)$. $\square$

Since the playing indiscernibles for $N^*[H]$ is also the least winning strategy for Player II, we obtain the following

Lemma 7.10. *σ is almost equal to the indiscernible strategy, which means that for every ordinal move $\langle \{\beta_n\} \mid n < \omega \rangle$ of Player 1 for all but finitely many n 's.*

$\sigma(\langle \{\beta_n\} \mid n < \omega \rangle)(k)$ is the indiscernible for β_k for all but finitely many k 's.

Using the same arguments for $M^*[H]$, r , and the fact that H_p and H_r disagree about the source of some Prikry sequence in $N^*[H] \cap M^*[H]$ we obtain the following.

Theorem 7.11. *In $V[H]$ there are elementary submodels which disagree about common ω -sequence of indiscernibles.*

[Git2] implies then to deduce the following corollary.

Corollary 7.12. *The game $\mathcal{G}_\chi$ is undetermined in $V[H]$.*

References

- [Git1] M. Gitik, The strength of the failure of SCH, Ann. of Pure and Appl. Logic 51 (1991), 215-240.
- [Git-Mit] M. Gitik and W. Mitchell, Indiscernible sequences for extenders and the Singular Cardinal Hypothesis.
- [Git2] M. Gitik, On measurable cardinals violating GCH, to appear in Ann. of Pure and Appl. Logic.
- [Sh] S. Shelah, Cardinal Arithmetic, to appear.
- [Git-Mag1] M. Gitik and M. Magidor, The Singular Cardinal Hypothesis Revisited, in MSRI Conf., 1991, 243-279.
- [Git-Mag2] M. Gitik and M. Magidor, Extender Based Forcing Notions, to appear in JSL.